

REMARKS

Claims 55-57 and 59 have been allowed. It is noted that claim 96 has been objected to, but claim 96 depends upon claim 55 and therefore should also have been allowed. The applicant therefore respectfully requests confirmation of the allowance of claim 96 in the next Office communication.

Claims 11, 12, 15-17, 20-23, 42, 43, 46-51, 85-90 and 103 have been objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but they would be allowable if rewritten. Claims 1, 6, 10, 13, 14, 24, 28-35, 37, 41, 44, 45, 52-54, 80, 91-95, 97-102 and 104-108 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 12, 35, 43 and 80 have been amended, and claims 11 and 42 have been canceled herein. The entirety of the claims that have been canceled include claims 2-5, 7-11, 18-19, 25-27, 36, 38-40, 42, 58 and 60-79. Claims 1, 6, 12-17, 20-24, 28-35, 37, 41, 43-57, 59, 80 and 85-108 are pending.

Paragraph 6 on page 5 of the Action recites that claims 11 and 42 were objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten. Consequently, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 11, and independent claim 35 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 42. Claims 11 and 42 have therefore been canceled. In addition, claim 80 has been amended along the same lines as claim 35. In view of these amendments, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of independent claims 1, 35 and 80. In addition, claims 6, 12-17, 20-24, 28-34, 37, 41, 43-54, and 85-96, which directly or indirectly depend upon one of claims 1, 35 or 80, should also be allowable.

Independent claim 97 has been rejected for allegedly being unpatentable over Luber et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,430,433 ("Luber") in view of Cho, U.S. Patent No. 6,154,300.

Independent claim 97 recites an apparatus including a video interface for a remote video display. It includes a video processing circuit that outputs a baseband video signal having a bandwidth of at least about 85 MHz, a remote receiver adapted for receiving the baseband video signal, and a remote electronic circuit configured to apply the baseband video signal to control and drive the remote video display device.

Luber pertains to an apparatus for image-supported treatment of a work object. In the embodiment shown in Fig. 1, a surgeon 4 wears a head mounted display 5 that is attached by a data lead wire 9 to a work object data unit 7 that receives data through data lead wire 13 from a position sensing unit 11 (see Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 1-12 of Luber). The Luber device

is therefore not wireless. Moreover, Luber does not suggest or teach a video processing circuit that outputs a baseband video signal having a bandwidth of at least about 85 MHz, or a remote receiver adapted for receiving the baseband video signal, or a remote electronic circuit configured to apply the baseband video signal to control and drive the remote video display device as recited in present claim 97.

Cho discloses a wireless data communication apparatus using a diffused infrared-ray antenna. In particular, Cho relates to a wireless communication apparatus for a network of computer terminals that solves the problems of line-of-sight communication and extends the coverage area of the data communication by amplifying a weak signal with a repeater (see col. 1, lines 15-22 of Cho). The cited passages of Cho at col. 3, line 40 to col. 4, line 60 describe how the system operates to send and receive data, but does not suggest or teach a video processing circuit that outputs a baseband video signal having a bandwidth of at least about 85 MHz. In fact, Cho is silent concerning video signals, and focuses on teaching to transmit data (which may be entered via a keyboard-- see col. 4, lines 65-66) by using a diffused infrared-ray antenna between two or more terminals (see Fig. 8, and col. 4, lines 38-60).

The applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion to combine the wired apparatus of Luber with the wireless communication apparatus of Cho, and in the absence of such teaching one skilled in the art would not combine them. Furthermore, even if the references were combined, the apparatus of the present invention would not be the result as both Luber and Cho fail to suggest or teach any components for generating and utilizing a baseband video signal. In particular, neither reference teaches or suggests a video processing circuit that outputs a baseband video signal having a bandwidth of at least about 85 MHz, or a remote receiver adapted for receiving the baseband video signal, or a remote electronic circuit configured to apply the baseband video signal to control and drive the remote video display device, as recited in present claim 97. The applicants therefore respectfully assert that Luber or Cho, taken either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest the apparatus as recited in claim 97.

In view of the above remarks, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of independent claim 97. In addition, claims 98-108 which directly or indirectly depend on claim 97 should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

In view of the remarks made herein, the applicants respectfully submit that the entire application is in condition for allowance, early notice of which would be appreciated. Should the Examiner not agree that all pending claims are allowable, then a personal or telephonic interview is respectfully requested to discuss any remaining issues and expedite the eventual allowance of these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 12, 2004


Allan A. Fanucci Reg. No. 30,256

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 28765

(212) 294-3311